

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA                     )  
   )  
v.   ) CASE NO. 2:05-cv-0654-MEF  
   )  
ALBERT CARTER, JR.                            )

**ORDER**

This cause is now before the court on defendant's Notice of Appeal (Doc. #3112) filed on October 18, 2007 which the court construes to contain a Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) provides that "[a]n appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith."<sup>1</sup> In making this determination as to good faith, a court must use an objective standard, such as whether the appeal is "frivolous." *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). "The statute provides that a court 'may dismiss the case if the allegation of poverty is untrue, or if satisfied that the action is frivolous or malicious.'" *Attwood v. Singletary*, 105 F.3d 610, 613

---

<sup>1</sup> See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e):

- (2) Notwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that--
  - (A) the allegation of poverty is untrue; or
  - (B) the action or appeal--
    - (i) is frivolous or malicious;
    - (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or
    - (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

(11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (1996)).

This circuit has defined a frivolous appeal under section 1915(d) as being one “without arguable merit.” *Harris v. Menendez*, 817 F.2d 737, 739 (11th Cir.1987)(quoting *Watson v. Ault*, 525 F.2d 886, 892 (5th Cir.1976)). “Arguable means capable of being convincingly argued.” *Moreland v. Wharton*, 899 F.2d 1168, 1170 (11th Cir.1990) (per curiam) (quoting *Menendez*, 817 F.2d at 740 n. 5); see *Clark*, 915 F.2d at 639 (“A lawsuit [under section 1915(d) ] is frivolous if the ‘plaintiff’s realistic chances of ultimate success are slight.’” (quoting *Moreland*, 899 F.2d at 1170)).

*Sun v. Forrester*, 939 F.2d 924, 925 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991), *reh’g denied*, 503 U.S. 999 (1992). See also *Weeks v. Jones*, 100 F.3d 124, 127 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (stating that “Factual allegations are frivolous for purpose of [28 U.S.C.] § 1915(d) when they are ‘clearly baseless;’ legal theories are frivolous when they are ‘indisputably meritless.’”) (citations omitted).

Applying the foregoing standard, this court is of the opinion that the defendant’s appeal is without a legal or factual basis and, accordingly, is frivolous and not taken in good faith.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the defendant’s motion to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* is DENIED; and that the appeal in this cause is certified, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(a), as not taken in good faith.

DONE this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Mark E. Fuller  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE